

1 ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
2 SARA J. DRAKE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
3 T. MICHELLE LAIRD  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
4 JEREMY STEVENS, State Bar No. 313883  
TIMOTHY M. MUSCAT, State Bar No. 148944  
5 Deputy Attorney General  
1300 I Street, Suite 125  
6 P.O. Box 944255  
Sacramento, CA 94244-2550  
7 Telephone: (916) 210-7779  
Fax: (916) 323-2319  
8 E-mail: Timothy.Muscat@doj.ca.gov  
*Attorneys for Defendants*

9  
LAW OFFICE OF FRANK LAWRENCE  
10 FRANK LAWRENCE, State Bar No. 147531  
ZEHAHA ZEVIT, State Bar No. 230600  
11 578 Sutton Way, No. 246  
Grass Valley, CA 95945  
12 Telephone: (530) 362-8434  
E-mail: Frank@FrankLawrence.com  
13 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

14  
15 IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
16 FOR THE EASTERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA  
17

18  
19 **PIT RIVER TRIBE, a federally recognized**  
**Indian tribal government,**

20  
21 Plaintiff,

22 v.

23 **GAVIN NEWSOM, Governor of the State**  
**of California, and the STATE OF**  
24 **CALIFORNIA,**

25 Defendants.  
26  
27  
28

2:20-cv-1918-AWI-SKO

**STIPULATION FOR GRANTING  
SUMMARY JUDGMENT IN  
PLAINTIFF'S FAVOR AND ORDER  
REQUIRING PARTIES TO PROCEED  
TO THE REMEDIAL PROCESS IN 25  
U.S.C. § 2710(d)(7)(B)(iii)-(vii)**

On July 28, 2022, the Ninth Circuit issued its published decision in *Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians v. California (Chicken Ranch)*, 42 F.4th 1024 (9th Cir 2022). That case involved whether the State of California (State) had failed to negotiate in good faith with five California tribes seeking new tribal-state compacts required by the Indian Gaming Regulatory Act (IGRA), 25 U.S.C. §§ 2710-2712, 18 U.S.C. §§ 1166-1167, in order for the tribes to conduct what IGRA defines as “class III gaming.” The court held that “IGRA strictly limits the topics that states may include in tribal-state Class III compacts to those directly related to the operation of gaming activities.” *Chicken Ranch*, 42 F.4th at 1029.

The *Chicken Ranch* court ruled that the State failed to engage in good-faith negotiations with five plaintiff tribes under IGRA by insisting on provisions not directly related to the operation of class III gaming activities. The specific provisions addressed by the Ninth Circuit concerned tribal recognition of spousal and child support orders for all gaming facility employees, environmental review and mitigation for a broadly defined set of projects, and broad tort claims coverage. *Chicken Ranch*, 42 F.4th at 1037-39. The court held that under 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(3)(C)(vii), “these family, environmental, and tort law provisions are not ‘directly related to the operation of gaming activities.’” *Id.* at 1038.

Similar to the plaintiff tribes in *Chicken Ranch*, plaintiff Pit River Tribe, a federally recognized Indian tribe (Pit River), is a former member of the Compact Tribes Steering Committee (CTSC). On August 19, 2014, the CTSC, a coalition of twenty-eight federally recognized California Indian tribes, wrote to inform the State of CTSC’s formation and its desire to begin the negotiation process for new class III gaming compacts. Pit River was a member of CTSC in 2014, and remained a member until July 6, 2020. As such, Pit River shares the same record of negotiations (RON) with the plaintiff tribes in *Chicken Ranch* from August 19, 2014, through July 6, 2020.

Pit River withdrew from negotiations with the State and filed its Complaint for Declaratory and Injunctive Relief (Complaint) on September 24, 2020. (Doc. 1.) The Complaint’s claim for relief alleged that the State failed in its duty to negotiate in good faith under IGRA. (*Id.* at 18-37.) Regarding this claim in Pit River’s Complaint, on June 15, 2021, Pit

1 River and the State and Governor Gavin Newsom (State Defendants) filed cross-motions for  
 2 summary judgment. (Docs. 18 & 19.) In these motions, the parties disputed whether the State  
 3 failed in its duty under IGRA to negotiate in good faith. These motions included disputes over  
 4 whether the State's proposed provisions regarding tort liability and remedies (Complaint, Count  
 5 Eight), tribal recognition of employee spousal and child support orders (Complaint, Count Ten),  
 6 and environmental review and mitigation (Complaint, Count One), exceeded the permissible  
 7 scope of negotiations under IGRA, 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(3)(C)(i)-(vii), and thus constituted a  
 8 failure by the State to negotiate in good faith. In addition, these motions included disputes over  
 9 other provisions proposed by the State. Some of those provisions were at issue in *Chicken Ranch*  
 10 but were not ruled upon by the Ninth Circuit in *Chicken Ranch*, while other provisions were not  
 11 specifically at issue in *Chicken Ranch*.

12 In support of their cross-motions for summary judgment, on June 15, 2021, the parties  
 13 each filed an identical Joint Statement of Undisputed Facts (JSUF). (Docs. 18-2 & 19-4.) The  
 14 stipulated facts in the JSUF included facts from the RON based upon CTSC compact negotiations  
 15 over tort claims coverage (JSUF, Nos. 16, 21, 44, 46, 50-51, 58, 99, 108, 146-49, 168, 175, 186 &  
 16 199), employee spousal and child support orders (JSUF, Nos. 49-52, 101, 158-61, 170 & 172),  
 17 environmental review and mitigation (JSUF, Nos. 16, 21, 23, 45, 96, 108, 129-33, 164 & 199),  
 18 and the other provisions at issue in the cross-motions for summary judgment (*e.g.*, JSUF, Nos. 16,  
 19 21-24, 26, 34, 36, 39-40, 43, 46-47, 49-52, 55-56, 58, 60, 65-66, 74, 78-79, 84-88 & 101.).

20 While Pit River and the State Defendants' cross-motions for summary judgment remain  
 21 pending before the Court, the Ninth Circuit's *Chicken Ranch* decision resolved the central legal  
 22 issues under IGRA in these motions – *i.e.*, generally the extent to which 25 U.S.C.  
 23 § 2710(d)(3)(C)(i)-(vii) limits the permissible scope of compact negotiations and whether the  
 24 State's insistence on compact provisions concerning tort claims coverage, employee spousal and  
 25 child support orders, and environmental review and mitigation constituted a failure to negotiate in  
 26 good faith.

27 Based on *Chicken Ranch*'s key holdings, the largely identical RONs in both this case and  
 28 *Chicken Ranch*, and the parties' JSUFs, the parties now request the Court, pursuant to this

1 stipulation, grant summary judgment in Pit River’s favor on its first claim for relief that the State  
2 failed to negotiate in good faith as required by IGRA because it sought “to negotiate for compact  
3 provisions that fall well outside of IGRA’s permissible topics of negotiation,” *Chicken Ranch*, 42  
4 F.4th at 1040, namely, tribal recognition of state court spousal and child support orders,  
5 environmental review and mitigation for a broadly defined set of “projects,” and broad tort claims  
6 coverage based upon California law, and order the parties to proceed pursuant to the remedial  
7 process set forth in IGRA, 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(7)(B)(iii)-(vii).

8  
9 Dated: December 8, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

10 ROB BONTA  
Attorney General of California  
11 SARA J. DRAKE  
Senior Assistant Attorney General  
12 T. MICHELLE LAIRD  
Supervising Deputy Attorney General  
13 JEREMY STEVENS  
Deputy Attorney General

14 /s/ Timothy M. Muscat

15 TIMOTHY M. MUSCAT  
Deputy Attorney General  
16 *Attorneys for Defendants*

17  
18 Dated: December 8, 2022

Respectfully submitted,

19 LAW OFFICE OF FRANK LAWRENCE

20 /s/ Frank Lawrence (as authorized on  
21 12/8/22)

22 FRANK LAWRENCE  
23 *Attorneys for Plaintiff*

**ORDER**

Based upon the above stipulation by the parties, summary judgment is granted in Pit River's favor on the claim for relief in its Complaint, consistent with the Ninth Circuit's decision in *Chicken Ranch Rancheria of Me-Wuk Indians v. California (Chicken Ranch)*, 42 F.4th 1024 (9th Cir. 2022), and the undisputed facts agreed upon by the parties.

Accordingly, the parties ARE HEREBY ORDERED to proceed pursuant to the remedial process set forth in IGRA, 25 U.S.C. § 2710(d)(7)(B)(iii)-(vii).

IT IS SO ORDERED.

Dated: January 26, 2023

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
SENIOR DISTRICT JUDGE